```
POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
2
                           STATE OF WASHINGTON
3
   IN THE MATTER OF
   JOSEPH P. MENTOR dba MENTOR
4
   CONSTRUCTION COMPANY,
                                               PCHB No. 78-195
5
                      Appellant,
                                               FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,
6
          v.
                                               CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
                                               AND ORDER
7
   PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION
   CONTROL AGENCY,
8
                     Respondent.
9
        This matter, the appeal from the issuance of a $250 civil penalty
10
   for the alleged violation of Section 9.15(a) of respondent's Regulation I,
11
   came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Dave J. Mooney,
12
   Chairman, Chris Smith, and David Akana (presiding) at a formal hearing
13
14
   in Seattle on January 8, 1979.
        Appellant Mentor Construction Company was represented by its
15
  attorney, Robert P. Love; respondent was represented by its attorney,
16
```

Having heard the testimony, having examined the exhibits, and

BEFORE THE

17

18

Keith D. McGoffin.

1

1 | having considered the contentions of the parties, the Found makes
2 | these

FINDINGS OF FACT

3

2

Furguent to ROW 43.21B.200 respondent has fulfill with this bests a perturbed copy of its Degulation I and attoroments thereto which we potate

permit particulate matham to be itsidisd, transformed or stored wis tut to thing reasonable pretautions to prevent the particulate matter from securing airports.

is, section 0.29 per ides for a dimil penalty of up to \$250 per day for each violation of Regulation 1.

ΞI

On only 12, 10/8, While in the vicinity of the Mentor Construction [Construction Medical Medical Medical Medical Approximate at 56:00 hitsep Way in hitsep [County, responde the inspector obstryed a considerable amount of [County, responde the inspector obstryed a considerable amount of [County, responde the inspector desired a sandblasting operation of countries that the countries of the control of the inspector learned that the inspector or other particular medical countries of the control of the resultant particulate ratter. The rankey countries was notified of the alleged violation one later informed proper one that the operation hould be stopped.

Por the folicycing event, a notice of violation for violating uses. (13(a) of Pegalation I was issued to MCC and it KPSC from the 1210 to 51% of 1 renally (CC hipedita to card penals)

FI L FI D. US OF E CT. CONCLUSIONS OF INW AND ORDER

KPSC did not appeal. 2 III 3 At all relevant times herein, MCC was the general contractor for the project at the work site and KPSC was an independent contractor 4 5 performing work at the site. 6 IV 7 Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact 8 is hereby adopted as such. 9 From these Findings, the Board comes to these 10 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 11 I 12 Appellant MCC was not shown to be responsible for the actions or omissions of KPSC, which actions violated Section 9.15(a). Thus, appellant 14 MCC did not cause or permit the violation as alleged. Accordingly, the 15 \$250 civil penalty should be stricken as to MCC. 16 ΙI 17 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law 18 is hereby adopted as such. 19 From these Conclusions the Board enters this 20 ORDER 21 The \$250 civil penalty as to Joseph P. Mentor dba Mentor 22 Construction Company is stricken. 2324 25

3

S F No 9928-A

27

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

AND ORDER

DIMED this 16 # __day of Ca. (** , 1979) 1 . POLIMITON CONTROL FLARINGS FLARA 3 1 5 Ĝ q 1.) 12

TI TI BI TI US OF DUL, CONCLUSIONS DE LI

TO NOTE OF THE